

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 9 and 13 have been amended hereby to correct matters of form, as requested by the Examiner. Claim 1 also has been amended to more particularly describe the invention. Support for amendment can be found at the first full paragraph on page 15, as well as at Figure 3.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,691 to Easley et al. ("Easley"); and claims 8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,855 to Christiansen et al. ("Christiansen"). To the extent this rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Applicants amend claims 1, 7, 9 and 13 to correct matters of form, as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, The objection of claims 1-13 is deemed overcome.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a Service Control Point ("SCP") in communication with the mobile switching system, the SCP including an Interactive Voice Response ("IVR") application for prepaid customers."

In contrast, Easley discloses an enhanced call return system in a wireless system. Easley discloses allowing a mobile subscriber to access caller-specific information stored in the IP. The mobile subscriber can access a caller's name, caller's telephone number and the date and time a call was received as part of an enhanced call return feature.

Easley does not disclose that an SCP contains an IVR application for prepaid services, as recited in claim 1. Because Easley does not teach each limitation recited in claim 1, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-7, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn as well based upon their dependence from claim 1.

Christiansen relates to a method of connecting an SCP in an ISUP network. Christiansen does not cure the deficiencies of Easley. Thus, a combination of Easley and Christiansen fails to teach or suggest an SCP containing an IVR application for prepaid services, as required by claims 8 and 10-12 by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Easley in view of Christiansen should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard  
McLean, VA 22102  
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: March 4, 2004

Respectfully submitted,  
JUDITH C. ESPEJO ET AL.

By: Tara L. Hutchings  
Tara L. Hutchings  
Registration No. 46,559

Attachments:

LDE/TLH